

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated August 21, 2009. All rejections and objections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Support for the present claim amendments is found throughout the application as originally filed. For example, support for the present claim amendments to claim 1 includes line 21 on page 23 through line 1 on page 24, and line 6 through line 7 on page 25 of the Specification as originally filed. Support for the present claim amendments to claim 33 includes lines 11-15 on page 31.

No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-3, 8-10, 33, 34, 35, 36, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on the combination of U.S. patent number 6,697,840 of Godefroid et al. ("Godefroid et al.") with U.S. patent number 6,212,548 of DeSimone et al. ("DeSimone et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In column 5, beginning at line 19, Godefroid et al. teach that a user may inquire about the presence of other users. In lines 21-31 of column 5, Godefroid et al. teaches that inquires may be made that relate to a user's interest in the presence of other users. In this regard, Godefroid et al. teach that a user may be interested in whether another user is currently in a collaborative session, user, the screen saver status of another user, whether another user is in a collaborative session, who the other participants are in such a collaborative session, and how long the other user has been chatting. To support such inquiries intended to meet such user interest, Godefroid et al. teach that a user interface sends check-availability (X), check-name(X), check-chatters(X)

messages to the rest of the presence awareness system, and receives available(X), unavailable(X), name(real(X), pseudo(Y)), and chatters(SID, SetOfChatters) messages from the presence awareness system, where each chat session is identified by a globally unique id "SID". See lines 41-48 in column 5.

DeSimone et al. disclose a system and method for multiple asynchronous text chat conversations, in which users communicate in multiple real-time text conversations (e.g., "chat sessions") in a client-server message processing environment using messages including a conversation index, a conversation-initiator ID and a list of message recipients. Each conversation in DeSimone et al. is maintained at client terminals in an individual window. DeSimone et al. disclose dropping and controlled adding of conversation participants is attended by message updates to other participants. DeSimone et al. teach that alternative peer-to-peer message handling reduces the processing burden on servers while allowing clients to perform control and display functions.

In Fig. 7, DeSimone et al. show multiple chat windows displaying chat sessions of a local user "Dawn". From line 61 in column 13 through line 40 in column 14, DeSimone et al. describe how an initiator of a session can become a participant in another session if indicated by an already existing participant in the other session.

Nowhere in the combination of Godefroid et al. and DeSimone et al. is there disclosed or suggested any method for providing a local computer user with detailed activity information regarding instant messaging sessions of remote users, comprising:

***sensing, at a remote computer system, a number of instant messaging sessions associated with a user of said remote computer system, wherein said number of instant messaging sessions associated with said user of said remote computer system is a total number of display windows currently open for instant messaging sessions on said remote computer system, and wherein said number of instant messaging sessions***

***associated with said user of said remote computer system is a plurality of instant messaging sessions;***

conveying said number of instant messaging sessions associated with said user of said remote computer system from said remote computer system to an awareness server application process;

conveying said number of instant messaging sessions associated with said user of said remote computer system from said awareness server application to an awareness client application process executing on a local computer system; and

***presenting, by said awareness client application process, responsive to said local computer system user selecting said remote computer system user, said number of instant messaging sessions associated with said user of said remote computer system in a display for said local computer system.*** (emphasis added)

as in the present independent claim 1. Neither Godefroid et al. nor DeSimone et al., taken independently or in combination, describe or suggest even the desirability of *a remote computer system sensing a number of instant messaging sessions associated with a user of the remote computer system that is a total number of display windows currently open for instant messaging sessions on the remote computer system, and presenting, by an awareness client application process, responsive to a local computer system user selecting the remote computer system user, the number of instant messaging sessions associated with the user of the remote computer system in a display for the local computer system*, as for example in the present independent claim 1. While Godefroide et al. teaches that it may be desirable to provide information regarding the presence of a remote user to a local user that reflects the local user's interest in whether the remote user is currently in a collaboration session, and potentially also the identities of the other participants in such a current session, and potentially also the time the remote user has been chatting, and while DeSimone et al. show a user interface in Fig. 7 that simultaneously shows two sessions in which a local user is currently participating, and the participants therein, neither Godefroide et al. or DeSimone et al. include any teaching as to a need for a remote computer system to determine how many windows are open on the remote computer system for instant

messaging sessions associated with a remote user. Instead, the teachings of the cited references appear to indicate a belief that a local user's interest with regard to a remote user's current instant messaging activity is limited to interest in whether the remote user is currently in a collaborative session (as in Godefroide et al.) and whether the remote user is currently in any of multiple collaborative sessions open with the local user (as in DeSimone et al.). Accordingly, not only do Godefroide et al. and DeSimone et al. include no teaching or suggestion of the above highlighted features of the present independent claim 1, Godefroide et al. and DeSimone et al. further include no teaching that would motivate a practitioner of ordinary skill to modify the systems described in Godefroide et al. or DeSimone et al. to include such features.

As to independent claim 34, it should similarly be evident from the above that the combination of Godefroide et al. and DeSimone et al. also does not disclose or suggest a system that includes program code for sensing, at a remote computer system, a number of instant messaging sessions associated with a user of said remote computer system, wherein said number of instant messaging sessions associated with said user of said remote computer system is a total number of display windows currently open for instant messaging sessions on said remote computer system, and wherein said number of instant messaging sessions associated with said user of said remote computer system is a plurality of instant messaging sessions, and program code for presenting, by said awareness client application process, responsive to said local computer system user selecting said remote computer system user, said number of instant messaging sessions associated with said user of said remote computer system in a display for said local computer system, as in the present independent claim 34.

As to independent claim 45, it should similarly be evident from the above that the combination of Godefroide et al. and DeSimone et al. also does not disclose or suggest a

computer program product that includes program code for sensing, at a remote computer system, a number of instant messaging sessions associated with a user of said remote computer system, wherein said number of instant messaging sessions associated with said user of said remote computer system is a total number of display windows currently open for instant messaging sessions on said remote computer system, and wherein said number of instant messaging sessions associated with said user of said remote computer system is a plurality of instant messaging sessions, and program code for presenting, by said awareness client application process, responsive to said local computer system user selecting said remote computer system user, said number of instant messaging sessions associated with said user of said remote computer system in a display for said local computer system, as in the present independent claim 45.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Godefroid et al. and DeSimone et al. does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims 1, 34 and 45. Accordingly, the combination of Godefroid et al. and DeSimone et al. does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to the present independent claims under 35 U.S.C. 103. Dependent claims 2-3, 8-10, 33, 35, 36, 41, 42, 43, and 44 are respectfully believed to be patentable over Godefroid et al. and DeSimone et al. for at least the same reasons. Applicants additionally specifically urge that the combined references further do not include any hint or suggestion of *displaying, by said awareness client application process, information indicating of which participant initiated each of said instant messaging sessions associated with said user of said remote computer system in said display for said local computer system*, as in the present dependent claim 33.

Claims 4-7 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on the combination of Godefroid et al. and DeSimone et al. with U.S. patent number 7,124,372 of Brin (“Brin”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As explained above, Godefroid et al. and DeSimone et al. do not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claim 1. Adding the disclosure of Brin to Godefroid et al. and DeSimone et al. fails to remedy the shortcomings of Godefroid et al. alone in this regard. Brin discloses a system that is capable of storing a time stamp in association with a specific portion of text (see Fig. 4B). However, like Godefroid et al. and DeSimone et al., Brin includes no teaching or suggestion of *a remote computer system sensing a number of instant messaging sessions associated with a user of the remote computer system that is a total number of display windows currently open for instant messaging sessions on the remote computer system, and presenting, by an awareness client application process, responsive to a local computer system user selecting the remote computer system user, the number of instant messaging sessions associated with the user of the remote computer system in a display for the local computer system*, as in the present independent claim 1, from which claims 4-7 depend.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Godefroid et al., DeSimone et al. and Brin does not disclose all the features of the present independent claim 1, and accordingly does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to the present independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103. As claims 4-7 depend from claim 1, they are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Godefroid et al., DeSimone et al. and Brin for at least the same reasons.

Applicants have amended claims and cancelled claims from further consideration in this Application. Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by unamended

and/or cancelled claims is not patentable. The claim amendments and cancellations were made solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue additional claims, including the subject matter encompassed by unamended or canceled claims, in one or more continuing applications.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

February 20, 2010  
Date

/David Dagg/  
David A. Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
44 Chapin Road  
Newton MA 02459  
(617) 630-1131